DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 080 UD 011 288

AUTHOR	Brown, Bernard Franklin
TITLE	A Study of the Operation and Effects of Selected Title I Programs.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	111p.; A Doctor of Education thesis submitted to Department of Elementary and Special Education, Michigan State University
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Classroom Techniques, Curriculum Development, Educational Objectives, *Elementary School Curriculum, *Elementary School Teachers, Federal Programs, Perception, Policy Formation, Program Evaluation, *Program Planning, *Teacher Participation, Teaching Experience, Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I Programs, Michigan

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the operation and effects of Title I ESEA programs operative in selected school districts in Michigan in relation to change in their respective elementary curricula as perceived by elementary school teachers. A total of 87 teachers took part. A questionnaire was developed and administered. In addition, data were collected from the summaries of Title I programs submitted by the local district to the Michigan State Department of Education. Analysis of the data suggested the following. Teachers perceived themselves as having a small part in the preparation of the Title I proposal in their districts. Approximately three-fourths of the teachers were unable to identify the person or persons responsible for determining the goals of the Title I programs in their districts. Teacher knowledge of the goals of the Title I program by grade level varied by groups. However, approximately one-half of the total sample did not know the goals for their own grade level. A majority of the teachers in the sample stated they had not changed their classroom teaching methods because of the Title I program in their district. A former Title I program in a school district is not financed locally if Federal funds are withdrawn. (Author/JM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED0 47080

A STUDY OF THE OPERATION AND EFFECTS OF SELECTED TITLE I PROGRAMS

By

Bernard F. Brown

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Department of Elementary and Special Education

1969

UD011288

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bernard
Franklin Brown

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright by
Bernard Franklin Brown
1969

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE OPERATION AND EFFECTS OF SELECTED TITLE I PROGRAMS

By

Bernard F. Brown

It was the purpose of this study to investigate the operation and effects of Title I programs operative in selected school districts in Michigan in relation to change in their respective elementary curricula as perceived by elementary school teachers.

No evaluation of elementary curriculum change as a result of Title I programs has been required by either the United States Office of Education or the Michigan State Department of Education. Since one of the purposes of Title I programs is to provide seed money for curriculum change, it would seem to follow that one effect of Title I programs in a school district would be to produce a change in the elementary curriculum.

The research hypothesis to be tested in this study was that the operation and effects of selected elementary Title I programs would not result in an elementary curriculum change. The following specific hypotheses were tested:

1. Elementary teachers did not serve on the committee which determined the goals for the Title I program in their district.
2. Even though a Title I program was conducted in the building in which he was teaching, the elementary classroom teacher would not know the goals of the Title I program.

3. Elementary teachers have not changed their classroom methods as a result of the Title I program which was operating or is operating in their district.
4. Innovations in the elementary curriculum, originally financed under Title I, are not continued in the elementary curriculum if the local district has to furnish the financing.

The sample used in this study was considered to be a stratified random sample of the total population of elementary teachers who were teaching in an elementary school which was conducting or had conducted a Title I program in a school district located in the area denoted by the Michigan Education Association as Region VIII of that organization. Thirty-seven school districts were located in Region VIII. The total number of teachers in the sample was eighty-seven.

A questionnaire was developed and administered to obtain data regarding the hypotheses to be researched. In addition, data were collected from the summaries of Title I programs submitted by the local district to the Michigan State Department of Education. Where a comparison of the teacher responses and the summaries of the local district was appropriate, a comparison was made.

The responses were tabulated, summarized, and compiled into tables containing frequencies and percentages. Analysis of the data seem to warrant the following conclusions:

Teachers perceived themselves as having a small part in the preparation of the Title I proposal in their districts.

Approximately three-fourths of the teachers were unable to identify the person or persons responsible for determining the goals of the Title I program in their districts.

Teacher knowledge of the goals of the Title I program by grade level varied by groups. However, approximately one-half of the total sample did not know the goals for their own grade level.

A majority of the teachers in the sample stated they had not changed their classroom teaching methods because of the Title I program in their district.

The data also indicated that a former Title I program in a school district is not financed locally if federal funds are withdrawn.

Since all of the specific hypotheses were found to support the research hypothesis, it would seem that the operation and effects of selected elementary Title I programs comprising this study did not result in an elementary curriculum change.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

When a person attains a long, sought-after goal, he is afforded an opportunity to realize the help which led to this accomplishment.

Academically, I am indebted to my committee, Dr. Clyde W. Dow, Dr. William K. Durr, and Dr. James B. McKee, for their continuous help and encouragement.

The Chairman of my committee, Dr. Calhoun C. Collier, advised, encouraged, criticized, and edited whenever needed. He deserves my very special thanks.

Of course, I can not overlook my three children, Pam, Karla, and Craig, who sacrificed much, helped much, and never complained during my pursuit of this degree.

The one person most responsible for reaching this goal, though, is my wife, Joyce. Her encouragement never ceased and her help was beyond mere thanks with words. To her I shall always be thankful; and to my wife, Joyce, I dedicate this manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION 1

The Problem 1

Need for the Study 2

Definitions of Terms Used 5

Statement of Hypotheses 6

Limitations of the Study 7

Overview of the Study 8

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 9

Promises of Title I 9

Disagreement as to Realization 10

Foundation Money and Results 11

Complexity of Change 14

Complexity of Curriculum Change 15

Federal Support 19

Planning for Curriculum Change 21

Need for Changing Teacher Insights, Attitudes, and Skills 25

Strategy for Curriculum Change 28

Need for Evaluation of Curriculum Change 29

Programs for the Disadvantaged 35

III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY 41

Introduction 41

Selection of the Sample 42

CHAPTER PAGE

III. (continued)

Data to be Collected 47

Collection of the Data 48

Treatment of the Data 49

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 51

Introduction 51

General Information Pertaining to Sample 52

Teacher Perception of Title I Programs 60

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 82

Summary 82

Conclusions 86

Recommendations 90

BIBLIOGRAPHY 92

APPENDIX A 97

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

I. School District Grouping by Pupil Enrollment 44

II. Type of Population Center 45

III. Number of Teachers by Group and in Total 47

IV. Total Years Teaching Experience 54

V. Teaching Experience in District 55

VI. Teaching Experience in Building 56

VII. Educational Preparation 58

VIII. Types of Michigan Certification 59

IX. Teaching Experience in Title I Programs 61

X. Teacher Participation in Preparation of Title I Proposal 63

XI. Teaching Experience in Title I and Participation in Preparation of Title I Proposal 65

XII. Teacher Perception of Person(s) Responsible for Determining Goals of Title I Program 66

XIII. Classroom Teaching Methods Changed Because of Title I Program 68

XIV. Teacher Perceptions of Grade Levels in Which Title I Program Was Operated 69

TABLE PAGE

XV. Teaching Experience in Title I and Changes in Methods 71
XVI. Teacher Response That a Former Title I Program is Now Financed by District 72
XVII. Title I Program Should Be Financed by Local District 74
XVIII. Do You Expect the Title I Program Will Be Financed by Local School District? 75
XIX. Goals of Title I Program as Selected by Teachers with Special Indication of District Goal for Each Group 77
XX. Teaching Experience in Title I and Knowledge of Goals 79
XXI. Teacher Responses by Grade Level Taught and Correct Selection of Goal of Title I Program 81

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the United States government has spent billions of dollars on educational programs throughout the nation. Title I of this act provides funds for educational programs designed specifically to meet the needs of disadvantaged youth. Local school districts were given guidelines to aid in determining both the needs and the location of disadvantaged youth in the local district. Each local district which participated in Title I funding decided what type of educational program it would provide, and then submitted a proposal for this program with approval required by the State Department of Education and the United States Office of Education. Once approval was granted by both agencies, the local district received funds with which to implement its program.

THE PROBLEM

It was the purpose of this study to investigate the operation and effects of Title I programs operative in selected school districts in Michigan in relation to change in their respective elementary curricula as perceived by elementary school teachers.

The findings of this study should indicate what effects, if any, Title I programs have had on elementary curriculum; it should provide guidelines to local school districts for evaluating their own programs; and it should provide the basis for further research recommendations.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

As of this writing, no evaluation of elementary curriculum change as a result of Title I programs has been made by either the United States Office of Education or the Michigan State Department of Education.[1] Since one of the purposes of Title I programs is to provide seed money for curriculum change,[2] it would seem to follow that one effect of Title I programs would be to produce a change in the elementary curriculum of school districts. Curricular changes do not occur in a vacuum; therefore, in order to evaluate curricular change resulting from Title I programs, it is also necessary to determine the operation and effects of Title I programs in relation to elementary school curricula. This study attempted to fill this gap by gathering information to provide a basis for researching and evaluating Title I programs.

The United States Office of Education requires each State Department of Education to submit annual summaries of all Title I programs that were operative during the preceding year in the state. However, the United States Office of Education does not require the use of a standard form for the summary submitted by the

---

[1] Dr. Stanley Ovaitt, Director of Evaluating Federal Programs, Michigan State Department of Education, April, 1968, an interview.

[2] U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Conference on Education of the Disadvantaged, Report of a National Conference Held in Washington, D. C., July 18-20, 1966, p. 5.

State Department of Education; and the United States Office of Education only offers guidelines for the respective State Departments of Education to follow.

The Michigan State Department of Education does require each local school district with a Title I program to use a standard form in describing the Title I program in its district. One section of this summary provides for an evaluation of the Title I program by the local school district, but no standard form of evaluation is required of the local school district. As a result, many types of evaluation are used by local school districts ranging from different types of standardized tests to subjective evaluation of the program by administrators. The required evaluation is not equated to curriculum change in the elementary school curriculum.

The quality of education available to children in the United States has been the subject of much study, discussion, and controversy. In recent years this concern has been expressed through the publications of such writers as Rickover,[3] Bestor,[4] Conant,[5] and many others.

---

[3] Hyman G. Rickover, Education and Freedom. (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1959).

[4] Arthur E. Bestor, The Restoration of Learning. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956).

[5] James B. Conant, The Education of American Teachers. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963).

Several factors are involved in the development of good educational opportunities for children. One of the most important of these factors is the performance of the teacher. However, Millstein, in his study, indicated that effects on classroom practices resulting from curriculum development activities were rare. He concluded that changing the curriculum implies changing the insights, attitudes, and skills of the teacher.[6]

The basic assumption which forms the basis for this study is that if a program were educationally sound and successfully funded under Title I, then related programs appropriate for other grade levels should be educationally sound, also. Or to state this assumption in another way, the basic goals and objectives of a Title I program should be incorporated into the school curriculum for all grades, not just the grade in which the Title I program is operating. For example, if the goal of a Title I program were to improve self-concept of students in grade one, then an appropriate program to imporve self-concept of students in grades two through six should be a legitimate goal. Likewise, if teaching methods should be changed for this type of Title I program, then they should be changed appropriately for the other grades. And, to be completely successful, all teachers in the school should be aware of the goal of the Title I program and try to implement this goal according to their grade level and need of the students.

---

[6] Abe Millstein, "The Effect of Teacher Participation in Curriculum Guide Development Upon Selected Classroom Practices," (Unpublished Doctor's thesis, Stanford University, 1960).

As mentioned earlier in this section, the evaluation of Title I programs required by the United States and the various State Offices of Education is not equated to curriculum change in the elementary school curriculum. Also, information regarding the performance of teachers in Title I programs is lacking, especially in regard to change of teaching methods.

This lack of information concerning Title I programs and the assumption made by the writer seemed to indicate a need to study the operation and effects of selected Title I programs. The assumption of the writer pertains to the Title I program itself, the performance or methods of the teachers, and the awareness of the goal of the Title I program by all teachers in the school operating a Title I program.

The study described in this dissertation is an attempt to meet the need of providing information regarding the operation and effects of Title I programs.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Curriculum. For the purpose of this study curriculum is defined as the learning experiences offered by the school, including teaching methods as one aspect of curriculum.

Operation. The term operation is interpreted as the process by which the goals of an elementary Title I program were developed in the district and the grade(s) in which the Title I program in the district was conducted or is conducted.

Educational program. In this study the term educational program is defined as that part of the curriculum in which the learning activities and content are planned within organized fields of knowledge or subjects.

Effects. The term effects is interpreted in this study as knowledge of the goals of the elementary Title I program that was conducted or is conducted in the school district; change brought about by the Title I program in the methods used by the teacher in the classroom; and the addition to the curriculum of an educational program which originally was financed under Title I but now is financed by the local school district.

Goals. For the purposes of this study the term goals is interpreted as those goals stated by a local school district in its Title I proposal submitted to the State Department of Education.

STATEMENT OF THE HYPOTHESES

The research hypothesis to be tested in this study was that the operation and effects of selected elementary Title I programs would not result in an elementary curriculum change. In order to test the research hypothesis, it was necessary to formulate specific hypotheses which would support or disprove the research hypothesis. The following hypotheses were tested:

1. Elementary teachers did not serve on the committee which determined the goals for the Title I program in their district.
2. Even though a Title I program was conducted in the building in which he was teaching, the elementary classroom teacher would not know the goals of the Title I program.
3. Elementary teachers have not changed their classroom methods as a result of the Title I program which was operating or is operating in their district.
4. Innovations in the elementary curriculum, originally financed under Title I, are not continued in the elementary curriculum if the local district has to furnish the financing.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Although it is believed that the conclusions to be drawn from the hypotheses presented above can be widely generalized, the testing of them will be limited to Title I programs in selected elementary schools in Michigan.

Certain other limitations are inherent in a study of this nature. Any investigation depending on a questionnaire for the collection of data may have the limitation imposed by the structure of the questionnaire. In spite of the fact that care was taken to refine the instrument, there may be misunderstanding and misinterpretation of questions. However, the questionnaire was chosen by the investigator as the most practical means of obtaining the necessary data.

Another limitation would be the disposition and attitude of the teachers while completing the questionnaire. And, of course, certain limitations arise from arbitrarily determining the size of the sample and the grade levels to be studied.

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

Chapter I presented a brief introduction, a discussion of the problem to be studied and the need for the study, special definitions used, the hypotheses to be researched, and the limitations of the study.

Subsequent chapters will deal with: (1) a review of the pertinent literature; (2) a description of the design and methodology used in this study; (3) an analysis of the data; (4) and a summary of the findings of the investigation, conclusions supported by the data, and suggestions and implications for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was hailed as "the most sweeping federal commitment to education the nation has ever made."[1] Francis Keppel stated that "this (greater federal) commitment embraces an ideal of the best education possible for every citizen."[2] Of the five Titles (or parts) of the original act, three were directly related to public school education. Title I pertained to educational programs for the disadvantaged; Title II was concerned with libraries and library materials; and Title III provided financial aid for innovations in educational programs regardless of the economic status of the students.

PROMISES OF TITLE I

Title I promised high hopes of helping solve the educational problems of the disadvantaged children in the United States. After signing this bill into law, President Johnson remarked, "Today, we reach out to 5½ million children held behind their more fortunate schoolmates by the dragging anchor of poverty."[3] Three years of operation of Title I programs throughout the nation has brought mixed reactions from critics and supporters. Although both groups agree that Title I "is not working out,"[4] the degree of lack of success varies from complete failure to being on the verge of a significant breakthrough in the education of disadvantaged children.

---

[1] Stanley M. Elam, Editorial, Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (September, 1965), p. 1.

[2] Francis Keppel, "The National Commitment to Education," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (December, 1965), p. 167.

DISAGREEMENT AS TO REALIZATION

Representative Roman Pucinski, D-Ill., chairman of the House General Subcommittee on Education maintains that:

> The Title I program obviously has not even begun to make an impact on motivating ghetto youngsters. You go across the length of the country and you find the money being spent on the same tired old ideas. It is a monumental flop and the outbreak of recent riots speaks louder than anything I can say about the total collapse of the program.[5]

Dr. Alice M. Rivlin, deputy assistant secretary for the program analysis with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare expressed the other extreme as follows:

> I think we have found the task is much tougher than we thought at the start...when it began, we really didn't know how to go about

---

[3] United States Office of Education, Guidelines: Special Programs for Educationally Deprived Children. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966), FOREWARD.

[4] Associated Press dispatch, The Raton (New Mexico) Daily Range, May 3, 1968.

[5] Ibid.

> it. We still don't, really, but we're trying to find out. There is no evidence that it (the program) has failed...I'm very optimistic. I think what we've got here is a big experimental program and I think it should be continued. At the very least it has focused attention on deprived children--something that wasn't true before.[6]

A study of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children showed "that less than one-third of all projects surveyed involved changes that encouraged experimentation or exploration."[7] Perhaps this lack of experimentation or exploration can be brought into better perspective by taking a brief look at another source of financial support for new programs--foundation money.

FOUNDATION MONEY AND RESULTS

The Fund for the Advancement of Education in its first ten years of operation gave its attention to five major areas of American education:

> 1) the recruitment and training of teachers, 2) the better use of teachers' time and talent, 3) extension to all of full educational opportunity commensurate with ability, 4) improvements in curriculums, and 5) improvements in school management and financing.
>
> Of these, the first has received about half of the money granted by the Fund in its first decade of operation. Second to this interest is the Fund's concern with the more efficient use of teachers'

---

[6] *Ibid*.

[7] *Ibid*.

> time and energy. The remaining three areas of interest have received less of the Fund's attention.[8]

The types of projects funded to explore the better use of teachers' time and talent were in the areas of team teaching, teacher aides, and the use of educational television. Most of these programs were related to secondary education and none pertained to methods of teaching in elementary.

In subsequent years the Fund did support projects such as the South Florida Education Center to study more effective use of new methods of teaching and new curricular offerings in grades K-14; and the Shaker Heights Learning Center with its emphasis on development of independent study and research skills at the elementary level.[9] But, by and large, projects supported by the Fund are college and secondary oriented and not elementary oriented.

Doherty reported on an interesting project funded by the Carnegie Foundation and conducted in Portland, Oregon. This project dealt with in-service education of teachers in Portland and surrounding districts. Doherty stated:

> The weakest aspect of teacher performance

---

[8] The Fund for the Advancement of Education. Decade of Experiment. (New York: 1961), p. 19.

[9] The Fund for the Advancement of Education. A Report for 1962-64. (New York: 1965), pp. 19-24.

> was defining instructional goals. The fact that these highly regarded teachers had so much difficulty with instructional objectives is a commentary on the failure of teacher education schools to produce competence in this important aspect of teacher education.[10]

In his evaluation of the in-service education project, Doherty states that:

> Perhaps the most lasting effect of the Carnegie Program will be the experience of over three hundred teachers in planning courses by specifying objectives of instruction, then designing learning experiences to achieve those objectives.[11]

Doherty also maintains that "the typical classroom teacher still does not think or plan instruction in terms of objectives."[12]

Even though there was a lack of experimentation or exploration among the Title I projects surveyed by the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, as mentioned above, it would appear that this is, with a few exceptions, no different from what has been happening in education. Of the eight foundations which fund special educational projects and which were investigated by the writer, only the few projects reported here pertained to elementary education, goals and objectives, and/or teaching methods. Regardless of the small number, the success of these foundation projects would appear to indicate Title I programs could be successful, too. The National Advisory Council found, to the contrary, that "most in-service teacher training--supported by federal funds--worked out to be a couple of hours after each school day with an average length of projects 10 days."[13] Contrast this finding with the Portland Project which lasted all year for the in-service training of teachers plus a full year of preparation. Advocates of Title I maintain too much change is expected too fast.

---

[10] Victor W. Doherty, "The Carnegie Professional Growth Program: An Experiment in the In-Service Education of Teachers," The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 18 (Fall, 1967), p. 262.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 265.

[12] *loc. cit.*

COMPLEXITY OF CHANGE

Harold Howe II, United States Commissioner of Education, endorsed Title I:

> "It's naive to assume that in two years time we can totally reverse trends and change institutions that are hard to change."
>
> Title I, he said, should be viewed as part of a package of federal programs, including model cities, designed to alleviate the problems of the big city slums.
>
> "Title I is the largest of all these programs. It represents a significant step toward meaningful help for those who are down and out in America."[14]

---

[13] Associated Press dispatch, loc. cit.

[14] Associated Press dispatch, loc. cit.

Even though there was a controversy regarding the effectiveness of Title I, the United States Congress appropriated the necessary funds to finance Title I programs for fiscal year 1968-1969. A continued part of Public Law 89-10 (which governs Title I) will be the requirement of evaluation by local education agencies of the Title I programs in their districts. Also implied in this law will be the hope that federal money will prove to be "seed" money for curriculum change to aid the disadvantaged.

COMPLEXITY OF CURRICULUM CHANGE

For the purposes of this study, the term curriculum was defined in Chapter I in its broad sense as the learning experiences offered by the school, including teaching methods as one aspect of curriculum. The broad interpretation of curriculum given in the first part of this definition was stated as early as 1931 by Stratemeyer when she wrote:

> The school curriculum, here defined to include the whole body of experiences which condition and make up the total activities of the child for which the school assumes responsibility...[15]

Saylor and Alexander also define curriculum in its broad sense by stating, "curriculum is all of the experiences in the learning situation.[16]

---

[15] Florence Stratemeyer, "Effective Use of Curriculum Materials," Contributions to Education, Number 460. (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931), p. 3.

By including teaching methods as one aspect of curriculum, the writer used the interpretation offered by McNally, Passow, and Associates that:

> ...it is the teachers and students who, in the last analysis, determine what the curriculum actually is...the curriculum can be changed only as the teacher himself changes...[17]

When curriculum change is considered from the standpoint of the statements presented above, the complexity of changing the curriculum becomes apparent. Smith, Stanlye, and Shores also conclude that changing the curriculum is complex when they state:

> Until recently, it was thought that curriculum change consisted largely of developing and installing new courses of study incorporating the latest methods and materials. It is now recognized that curriculum change is a very complex process involving the personalities of parents, students, and teachers, the structure of the school system, and the patterns of personal and group relations among

---

[16] J. Galen Saylor and William M. Alexander, Curriculum Planning. (New York: Rinehart and Company, 1954), p. 63.

[17] Harold J. McNally, A. Harry Passow and Associates, Improving the Quality of Public School Programs. (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1960), p. 39.

members of the school and community.[18]

Caswell believes that this complexity could influence future curriculum development. He states:

> Throughout much of the curriculum movement there has been a tendency to look on curriculum change as a relatively simple matter. Recently, it has become more fully recognized that achievement of change in the curriculum is a slow and difficult process...Recognition of the difficulty and complexity of curriculum change may be expected to exert an important influence in the further development of curriculum programs.[19]

Taba indicated that changing the curriculum required a twofold approach. She wrote:

> To change a curriculum means, in a way, to change an institution. Changing institutions involves changing both goals and means, although goals and institutionalized means may not always correspond.
>
> Changing the curriculum also involves changing individuals. Changing individuals involves two types of changes. One is the change in the way he is oriented to the world around him. The other is the change in his emotional orientation.

---

[18] B. Othaniel Smith, William O. Stanlye and H. Harlan Shores, Fundamentals of Curriculum Development. (Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: The World Book Company, 1950), p. 634.

[19] Hollis B. Caswell and associates, Curriculum Improvement in Public School Systems. (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1950), p. 66.

> An effective strategy of curriculum change, therefore, must proceed on a double agenda, working simultaneously to change ideas about curricula and to change human dynamics.[20]

Another dimension of the complexity of curriculum change is presented by Ragan. He maintains that:

> Perhaps never before has the task (of providing an education for children in the United States) been so complex. Not only must the school provide competent teachers, adequate buildings, and modern equipment for a tidal wave of children, but it must at the same time reshape its program in the light of new conditions of living.[21]

Can the complex problem of curriculum change be accomplished? Keppel believes that:

> Educators can make a major contribution by driving to raise quality, particulary in the slum schools. For the over-all social health of the United States...the nation must provide more money relatively to those schools than to the rest of the community.[22]

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was a deliberate attempt on the part of the federal government to influence curriculum change in the area of education for disadvantaged youth.

---

[20] Hilda Taba, Curriculum Development. (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1962), p. 454.

[21] William B. Ragan, Modern Elementary Curriculum. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966), p. 3.

[22] Francis Keppel, The Necessary Revolution in American Education. (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966), pp. 48, 49.

FEDERAL SUPPORT

Campbell and Sroufe would seem to agree with Keppel when they state that:

> ...education is a major governmental responsibility and...because education is increasingly recognized as vital to the national interest...we may anticipate additional national participation.[23]

Historically, the federal government has provided categorical support to education, such as, passage of the Ordinance of 1785, First Morril Act in 1862, Smith-Hughes Vocational Act of 1917, G.I. Bill of Rights in 1944, N.D.E.A. in 1958, and the E.S.E.A. in 1965 to mention only a few. Campbell and Sroufe list twenty-two major federal programs directly related to education.[24]

Involvement by the federal government in direct financial aid to education has been a frequently debated topic. Keppel sees:

> The key issue in the relationship of local, state, and federal governments in education has come to be whether other than local influences or restraints can be brought to bear on school boards without endangering their capacity for initiative and responsibility. The answer is clearly "yes."[25]

---

[23] Roald F. Campbell and Gerald R. Sroufe, "Toward a Rationale for Federal-State-Local Relations in Education," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (September, 1965), p. 6.

[24] Ibid., p. 5.

[25] Keppel, op. cit., p. 62.

Fuller believes in the necessity of government financing of education because "Only in this century has the full development of human resources become an individual need and a public necessity."[26]

The aim of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act "is to help broaden and strengthen education for the children of poverty, wherever they may be found."[27]

One reason for concentrating on the education of "the children of poverty" is presented by Keppel when he states that:

> A higher dropout rate and a general lower educational level are characteristic of pockets of poverty. The lack of resources to combat poverty inevitably leads to lower ambitions.[28]

Since curriculum change is a complex process and one of the goals of Title I is to change curriculum in the area of educating the disadvantaged, it would seem that the operation and effects of Title I programs would be evaluated. However, as mentioned in Chapter I, there was no standard form or manner for local educational agencies to evaluate the programs operating in their districts; and a thorough search of the literature revealed no record of evaluating Title I programs in the areas of operation and effects as defined in Chapter I of this study. This review of the literature did reveal some significant information regarding planning curriculum change; the need for changing teacher insights, attitudes, and skills; the need for evaluation of curriculum change; and descriptions of some educational programs for the disadvantaged.

---

[26] Edgar Fuller, "Government Financing of Public and Private Education," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (March, 1966), p. 366.

[27] United States Office of Education, loc. cit.

[28] Keppel, op. cit., p. 78.

PLANNING FOR CURRICULUM CHANGE

When Title I is considered as a deliberate attempt to change curriculum and changing curriculum is accepted as a complex process, then planning for curriculum change through Title I programs should be a careful, well-thought-out procedure. Although the literature does not specifically present plans for curriculum change through Title I programs, it does contain much about planning for curriculum change in general. The information presented below could be easily adapted to planning Title I programs for the purpose of changing the curriculum.

Beauchamp believes that:

> The first task for members of curriculum planning groups must be that of agreement on the role, or roles, for the school as a social institution. It is only through understanding of these roles that planners can functionally interpret them in the form of a school program.[29]

---

[29] George A. Beauchamp, Planning the Elementary School Curriculum. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1956), p. 88.

Not only must agreement be reached "on the role, or roles, for the school as a social institution," but Spears points out another area of tremendous importance in working toward improved curriculum. He maintains:

> It has been shown time and time again, in both national educational movements and local school district action, that schools and school people must live by founded beliefs and proven principles if they are to make meaningful rather than confusing gestures in their movement toward either adequate school support or improved curriculum.[30]

Since Title I programs are a part of the school program, they are also a part of the school as a social insitutiton, and they require financial support. Hopefully, Title I programs also seek to improve the curriculum. Therefore, if we apply the statements of Beauchamp and Spears to Title I programs, groups planning Title I programs should agree on the social implications of these Title I programs and strive to base these programs on "founded beliefs and proven principles".

Ragan offers another area for consideration in planning for curriculum change. He states that:

> Some of the difficulties that school systems have encountered in making innovations in school

---

[30] Harold Spears, Curriculum Planning Through In-Service Programs. (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957), p. 29.

> programs have resulted from a lack of understanding on the part of parents and other laymen...[31]

Ragan's statement would seem to indicate that clear communication channels should be maintained in curriculum improvement.

In discussing the area of educational purposes, Krug believes that:

> The defining of educational purposes is a group process and should be characterized by the most effective possible kind of democratic group participation.[32]

Krug also cautions that:

> ...conflict between the down-to-earth school people on the one hand and the curriculum philosophers on the other has served to sharpen an educational issue. It has served also to promote acrimonious contention in an area where cooperative effort is sadly needed.[33]

After a group has been organized for curriculum improvement, conditions should be such that the group could produce results. In commenting on this area, Ragan suggests that:

> Curriculum improvement involves many types of activities. The school staff examines research dealing with factors that influence learning, experiments with techniques for

---

[31] Ragan, _op_. _cit_., p. 27.

[32] Edward A. Krug, _Curriculum Planning_. (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1950), p. 67.

[33] _Ibid_., p. 4.

> gaining a better understanding of children, analyzes recent social trends, and makes surveys of the local community. It prepares curriculum guides, and develops the over-all design of the curriculum.[34]

The training of teachers is an essential part of any program developed to change the curriculum. Dufay maintains:

> ...the ideal way of dealing with an elaborate new program is through in-service training.[35]

The reason for in-service training of teachers is given by Spears:

> Essential to every school system is an organized program of in-service development for teachers and administrative staff. It is just as logical as the program of instruction for the pupils, it being impossible to conceive of pupil growth without teacher growth.[36]

McNally, Passow, and Associates concur in the need for in-service training when they state:

> Once curriculum workers (accept) the view that little real curriculum improvement occurs without continuous professional and personal growth of teachers, concern (shifts) from administrative structure to include

---

[34] Ragan, op. cit., p. 182.

[35] Frank R. Dufay, Ungrading the Elementary School. (West Nyack, N. Y.: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1966), p. 161.

[36] Spears, op. cit., p. 30.

> the complexities of educating the professional staff.[37]

In emphasizing the need for in-service training, Spears also believes:

> Just as there is movement in the lives of the learners so there is commonly accepted today the idea of continuous growth on the part of the teachers.[38]

Any discussion of curriculum change should also contain comments regarding the human and emotional factors involved in change.

NEED FOR CHANGING TEACHER INSIGHTS, ATTITUDES, AND SKILLS

The definition given in Chapter I of this study for the term curriculum not only includes the learning experiences offered by the school, but it also includes teaching methods.

In discussing curriculum planning, Beauchamp appears to agree with the first part of the definition of curriculum when he suggests that:

> The purpose of curriculum planning is to improve the educational experiences for our school pupils.[39]

On the other hand, Krug would seem to agree with the complete definition from his statement that:

> Good teaching and good learning are the

---

[37] McNally, _op. cit._, p. 38.

[38] Spears, _op. cit._, p. 314.

[39] Beauchamp, _op. cit._, p. 174.

> reasons for which all other aspects of curriculum development exist.
>
> Unfortunately, there has been a tendency in the past to separate these two aspects of the teaching and learning situation. This has resulted in the identification of curriculum with content only and in the setting forth of method as a separate problem.[40]

McNally, Passow, and Associates are more emphatic in considering the teacher as the human element in curriculum change. They maintain:

> (The key position in curriculum improvement is) the classroom teacher in effecting the kind and quality of learning experiences. The first corollary is the need for arrangements designed to induce change in the insights, understandings, attitudes, and relationships of the teacher.[41]

In working with the teacher and curriculum change, Dufay believes that:

> Teachers need the opportunity to raise questions, to ask for more elaborate explanations on certain details; they need to feel that the new program is something of special value.[42]

In discussing the role of the teacher in curriculum change, and the complexity of curriculum change, consideration should be given to the responsibilities of those involved in any curriculum change. Beauchamp believes that:

---

[40] Krug, _op_. _cit_., p. 8.

[41] McNally, _op_. _cit_., p. 38.

[42] Dufay, _op_. _cit_., p. 162.

> Teachers are constantly confronted with problems that are directly related to their school curriculum. Attempts to solve these problems may lead to action conducive to curriculum improvement.[43]

Saylor and Alexander suggest that:

> ...the major responsibility for improving the learning experiences of children rests with...the pupils and teacher of individual learning groups. This is the level at which curriculum improvement in terms of children's learning will occur.[44]

In his discussion of responsibilities for curriculum improvement, Pritzkau maintains that:

> ...it is hoped that everyone in the school system will consider curriculum improvement an integral phase of his position. Since the development of the conditions for learning experiences is the responsibility of every individual in the school, it follows that curriculum improvement is everyone's responsibility.[45]

Pritzkau suggests one area of curriculum which is often neglected when he says:

> ...the nature of the school organization frequently contributes to the exclusion of the values of children.[46]

---

[43] Beauchamp, _op. cit._, p. 175.

[44] Saylor and Alexander, _op. cit._, p. 66.

[45] Philo T. Pritzkau, _Dynamics of Curriculum Improvement_. (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 8.

[46] _Ibid._, p. 176.

Administrators who are working with teachers in the area of curriculum improvement should strive to exert maximum leadership to produce maximum teacher involvement. Otherwise, as Spears suggests:

> Since instruction is a unified effort of a school or a school system linking the work of all teachers, the ineffective classroom represents the weak link that threatens the entire chain.[47]

In working on curriculum improvement, Pritzkau believes that:

> The principal with the help of the teachers should make the necessary arrangements for the exchange of ideas for the purpose of improving learning experiences.[48]

STRATEGY FOR CURRICULUM CHANGE

As mentioned in Chapter I and earlier in Chapter II, one of the main goals for Title I programs is that they would produce curricula changes in the educational programs offered disadvantaged youth. In the discussion presented above, certain points were suggested for consideration in curriculum change. Taba suggests a methodology to achieve a strategy for curriculum change which includes human and emotional factors also. Her summary follows:

1. Curriculum change requires a systematic sequence of work which deals with all aspects of the curriculum ranging from goals to means.

---

[47] Spears, op. cit., p. 104.

[48] Pritzkau, op. cit., p. 15.

2. A strategy for curriculum change involves creating conditions for productive work.
3. Effecting curriculum change involves a large amount of training.
4. Change always involves human and emotional factors. To change thinking about curriculum one also needs to change people's attitudes toward what is significant and perceptions about role, purposes, and motivation.
5. Since curriculum development is extremely complex, it requires many kinds of competencies in different combinations at different points of work.
6. Managing curriculum change requires skilled leadership. It also requires distributed leadership.[49]

If continued effort is made to achieve curriculum change, then perhaps what Goodlad suggests will come to pass:

> ...efforts at the lower levels of schooling (elementary level) may ultimately influence planning at the higher levels--the reverse of what has commonly occurred in the past.[50]

Once a program is in operation, plans should be made to conduct a thorough evaluation of that program. Title I programs are evaluated, but a question of the thoroughness of the evaluation is raised here.

NEED FOR EVALUATION OF CURRICULUM CHANGE

Title I was neither the first nor the only attempt at deliberately changing the curriculum in the public schools. Since Sputnik, there have been many national curriculum movements in almost every area of education. Improvement of curricula in such areas as the "new" math, the "new" science, and the "new" social studies are some examples of other national curriculum movements. National concern for the educational program offered in public schools was expressed by Beauchamp when he said:

---

[49] Taba, op. cit., pp. 455, 456.

[50] John I. Goodlad, The Changing School Curriculum. (New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1966), p. 97.

> Rapid social change in contemporary life demands that we utilize every available procedure to keep our public school curriculum as dynamic as our social life.[51]

However, changing curriculum for the sake of change is not necessarily the only aspect of curriculum development. Taba introduces another important element of curriculum development by stating:

> Evaluation...is an integral part of curriculum development, beginning with the concern about objectives and ending with assessment of their attainment.[52]

Commenting on the new national curriculum movements, Goodlad suggests that:

> At least four different means of evaluating new programs have been used: 1) observations of whether or not the students for whom the material is intended appear to be progressing successfully; 2) both casual and systematic questioning of students involved in the programs; 3) periodic examination of students by tests designed to cover the new material; 4) comparative testing

---

[51] Beauchamp, op. cit., p. 260.

[52] Taba, op. cit., p. 313.

> of students in the new and the old programs with traditional and specially designed tests.[53]

In attempting to define the term evaluation Saylor and Alexander state:

> In the simplest terms, to evaluate is "to determine the value of." The evaluation of curriculum planning is the determination of the value of that planning. Thus evaluation is one phase of the total process of curriculum planning.[54]

Beauchamp believes in the importance of evaluation even more strongly when he says:

> ...evaluation is an integral part of any school program. In fact, evaluation is so important that provision should be made for it in the school curriculum.[55]

Although evaluation is recognized as an important aspect of curriculum planning, Saylor and Alexander suggest that:

> Evaluation is frequently the weakest link in this chain of curriculum planning. After the planning is done is not the time to decide to evaluate.[56]

Ragan would concur with Saylor and Alexander with the comment:

> Evaluation is not something that is done after teaching has been completed; it takes

---

[53] Goodlad, op. cit., pp. 98, 99.

[54] Saylor and Alexander, op. cit., p. 579.

[55] Beauchamp, op. cit., p. 260.

[56] Saylor and Alexander, loc. cit,

> place simultaneously with teaching and learning.[57]

In describing the processes of planning and evaluation, Saylor and Alexander believe that:

> ...planning and evaluation are complementary processes which should occur almost simultaneously and continuously...Although plans and judgments are being made together, there are still discrete procedures which may be planned to ensure sound judgments. In general, these procedures, in relation to curriculum planning, are of two types: those which evaluate planning as a process, and those which evaluate planning through its results.[58]

Taba describes evaluation in this way:

> Evaluation is a broader undertaking than that of giving tests and grading students. It involves: (1) clarification of objectives to the point of describing which behaviors represent achievement in a particular area; (2) the development and use of a variety of ways for getting evidence on changes in students; (3) appropriate ways of summarizing and interpreting that evidence; and (4) the use or the lack of it to improve curriculum, teaching, and guidance.[59]

Another description of evaluation is that given by Beauchamp:

> In general, evaluation may be considered to be a triple-phased, circular process. The first phase of the process is one of determining

---

[57] Ragan, op. cit., p. 454.

[58] Saylor and Alexander, op. cit., p. 580.

[59] Taba, op. cit., p. 313.

> whether or not sought goals have been achieved. A second phase is that of determining the adequacy of the means utilized to achieve the goals. The third phase is a matter of determining whether the achieved goals were, in the final analysis, worthy of the effort.[60]

In discussing evaluation, Taba gives the next logical step by stating:

> Since the curriculum is essentially a plan for helping students to learn, ultimately all evaluation goes back to the criterion of effectiveness of learning.[61]

Krug believes that:

> Evaluation activities are the key to all educational experimentation and to most educational research of any variety. They are also the key to much of our classroom teaching and so become part of curriculum development itself.[62]

In his statement above, Krug introduced a new area of curriculum development which was not stated up to this point but was certainly implied. Classroom teaching is an important area of curriculum development and also an important area of evaluation. Ragan suggests:

> The purpose of (evaluation) is, of course, to enable the teacher to provide educative experiences for which the child is ready and which meet his developmental needs.[63]

---

[60] Beauchamp, _op_. _cit_., p. 264.

[61] Taba, _op_. _cit_., p. 311.

[62] Krug, _op_. _cit_., p. 264.

[63] Ragan, _op_. _cit_., p. 452.

Krug goes on to say:

> (Evaluation) enters first into the process of translating the large and comprehensive statements of the task of the school into specific behavioral objectives applicable to classroom teaching. It enters secondly into the process of teaching, since behavior-sampling comes in as part of our normal introductory, developmental, and concluding activities of units of experience.[64]

That teaching is a part of evaluation and curriculum improvement is also believed by McNally, Passow, and Associates when they state:

> ...the evaluation of the curriculum improvement program must be primarily in terms of those characteristics which theory, experience, and research indicate to be effective and desirable in yielding better teaching and learning.[65]

In addition to the implication and statements that teaching is a part of evaluation and curriculum development, another implication can be interpreted from what has been said. Evaluation is not static. Or as Krug says:

> All phases of the school program should be continuously evaluated in the light of whatever philosophical criteria seem most useful and desirable. This means, of course, that formalized classroom instruction must be included.[66]

---

[64] Krug, _op_. _cit_., p. 266.

[65] McNally, _op_. _cit_., p. 311.

[66] Krug, _op_. _cit_., p. 286.

Since Title I is a deliberate attempt to change curriculum, it would seem to follow that the basic principles of curriculum change, teacher change, and evaluation should be incorporated in the development of Title I programs. The following descriptions of programs for the disadvantaged would seem to point toward the concern expressed by Ragan when he said:

> To the extent that objectives, learning activities, or evaluation become independent, they become formal and unrelated to the teaching-learning situation.[67]

PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

The emphasis of Title I programs has been directed toward elementary children as evidenced by the fact that "68 per cent of the children being served through Title I are in the range from preschool through sixth grade."[68] With this large per cent of programs directed toward the elementary school child, the importance of the teacher in the teaching-learning situation becomes a major area of concern. In working with Operation Head Start children, Connors and Eisenberg found that "teachers who were rated as warm, varied, active, and flexible also tended to produce most IQ improvement."[69] In conjunction with this importance of teachers, Gerwitz suggests that "new pedogogical understandings and techniques must be employed to meet this challenge (of educating the disadvantaged)."[70]

---

[67] Ragan, op. cit., p. 453.

[68] "What's New in the E.S.E.A. Amendments," American Education, Vol. 3, No. 2 (February, 1967), p. 18.

In addition to the importance of the teacher in educating the disadvantaged, Gerwitz comments on the importance of education for the disadvantaged when he states that:

> The education of the disadvantaged child is regarded by many specialists in the field of urban problems as the most promising escape route these children have from the whirlpool of poverty and social disruption that is already submerging so many of our unskilled urban population.[71]

Recognizing a need to work with teachers of the disadvantaged, Wayne State University and the Detroit Public Schools combined to present a workshop for teachers assigned to inner city schools. Obradovic in evaluating this workshop found that:

> While teachers generally acknowledged a lack of preparation of the children for work

---

[69] C. Keith Connors and Leon Eisenberg, "The Effect of Teacher Behavior on Verbal Intelligence in Operation Head Start Children," Final Report. U. S. Office of Education, Research Project ED 010 782, 1966, p. 23.

[70] Marvin H. Gervitz, and others. "Teaching the Disadvantaged - Summer Institute for Professional Training of Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators," Final Report. U. S. Office of Education, Research Project ED 011 018, 1966, p. 1.

[71] *loc. cit.*

> at their grade level, in no case did a teacher indicate that he was attempting to make up deficiencies by modifications in the teacher-programmed classroom activities so that the children would be closer to grade level at the end of the school year.[72]

Gerwitz found that there was a discrepancy between what the teaching staff of a summer institute regarded as the primary objectives of the institute and what the participants considered the primary objectives. The staff felt that knowledge of sociological and conceptual theory should be the objectives. The participants, however, were more concerned with the practical knowledge relevant to the situation.[73] One of the conclusions drawn from conducting this summer institute was that it can be a promising way to reach the disadvantaged by offering their teachers proper orientation about the special problems of these children.[74]

According to Kincaid, the Minnesota Department of Education was led to develop a short course for reading teachers because "no school program can be any better than the teachers who are responsible for it."[75] The Minnesota Department of Education called a meeting with representatives of colleges which prepare teachers, and it "was agreed that the colleges had not done much to help prospective teachers learn how to deal with the students of lower ability."[76] Kincaid also suggests that:

---

[72] Sylvia M. Obradovic, "Evaluation of a Workshop for Teachers Newly Assigned to Inner City Schools," U. S. Office of Education, Research Project ED 011 242, 1966, p. 30.

[73] Gerwitz, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 83.

[75] Gerald L. Kincaid, "A Title I Short Course for Reading Teachers," *The Reading Teacher*, Vol. 20, No. 4, (January, 1967), p. 307.

> ...one of the major obstacles to learning for the disadvantaged has been that most teachers lacked understanding of such children and lacked faith in the ability of such children to learn.[77]

He reports the reason for this was that:

> ...the teacher was unaware of the gaps or shortcomings in the child's early educational background and was unaware of what should or could be done about those shortcomings.[78]

The Minnesota Department of Education conducted classes throughout the state in April, May, and June, 1966. One of the objectives of these classes was to motivate teachers in learning to understand the disadvantaged child. In the evaluation of the classes held through the month of June

> the major disappointment was the fact that "understanding the disadvantaged child" was seldom mentioned as the "most helpful." Most of the participants indicated that the new materials presented were the "most helpful" part of the course.[79]

---

[76] *Ibid*., p. 308.

[77] *Ibid*.

[78] *Ibid*.

[79] *Ibid*., p. 311.

The role of the teacher in the education of the disadvantaged is highlighted in the reports cited above. No less important is what happens _after_ the disadvantaged child has been in a special program. Cauman says that "follow-through in programs for the disadvantaged is a real responsibility."[80]

In the same issue as Cauman's article there is a feature article which describes five Title I projects which are designed specifically to follow through on Head Start.[81] Perhaps it should be noted at this point that Head Start is funded under the Office of Economic Opportunity and Title I is funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Title I projects in the article referred to above are in some cases funded jointly from the offices of Economic Oportunity and Title I.[82] It should be noted that these projects were designed to follow through on Head Start programs and were limited to kindergarten and first grade.[83]

As mentioned earlier, a thorough search of the literature revealed no record of evaluating Title I programs in the areas of operation and effects as defined in Chapter I. In fact, a series of regional meetings held by the United States Office of Education in the area of evaluation research revealed that "the state department of education people attending the conferences displayed a great deal of unclarity about the evaluation requirements."[84]

---

[80] Judith Cauman, "The Fine Art of Follow Through," _Grade Teacher_, Vol. 84, No. 4 (December, 1966), p. 104.

[81] "How Title I Programs Follow Through on Head Start," _Grade Teacher_, Vol. 84, No. 4 (December, 1966), p. 88.

[82] _loc. cit._

[83] _loc. cit._

Since there was a complete absence of research regarding the operation and effects of Title I programs as described in this study, it was decided to investigate this area so that disadvantaged children might eventually benefit from research generated by this study.

---

[84] Charles N. Seashore, "Regional Meetings in Evaluation Research," Office of Education, Research Project ED 010 229, 1966, p. 10.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

In the section on Need for the Study in Chapter I, reference was made to the fact that the United States Office of Education and the Michigan State Department of Education had not made an evaluation of elementary curriculum change as a result of Title 1 programs. In Chapter II it was noted that a search of the literature revealed no investigation of the operation and effects of Title 1 programs as defined in this study. With these facts in mind this study was designed as a pilot study to investigate and describe the operation and effects of selected Title I programs. A single cell study of this nature is described by Barnes as:

> ...the over-all design used in school surveys, many research studies, assessment studies, status studies, and case studies. Treatment of the data is usually descriptive in nature...As such, this is actually a report on what exists at the time of the study.
>
> When we have gathered adequate data about the group being studied, we can relate various characteristics and gain information about factors which may have been previously obscure. The more we study such a single cell, the more confident we become that certain forces may be influential in shaping the results we uncover.[1]

---

[1] Fred P. Barnes, Research for the Practitioner in Education (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, Department of Elementary School Principals, 1964), p. 65.

The writer hoped this descriptive study and survey of teachers would emphasize the need, and provide some clues, for researching and evaluating Title I programs.

SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE

The procedure for selection of the sample used in this study was based on the description given by Barnes when he stated that:

> There are many ways to draw a smaller sample from a larger group. But in all the many different types of samples, the most important characteristic is randomness. By this is meant that every single sampling unit in the population has an equal chance of being drawn into the sample...In using this procedure, every effort is made to reduce the possibility that selection of the sample will be influenced by either conscious or subconscious bias and to leave instead the decision solely to sheer chance.[2]

Although randomness was a necessary requirement in the selection of the sample used in this study, the investigator and his doctoral committee believed that a further refinement of the sample was important to the study. The population from which the sample was drawn for this study was comprised of definite sub-groups or strata. Therefore, the investigator and his committee decided that a stratified random sample would be used in this study. Barnes describes this approach as using:

> ...the same "blind but fair" techniques which characterize random sampling. But when

---

[2] *Ibid*., p. 38.

> a population is composed of several subpopulations, it may be divided into two or more strata. A random sample is taken from each stratum, with the subsamples joined to form the total sample. There is no attempt to make stratified samples a replica of corresponding populations; the intent in stratified random sampling is only to take into account the anticipated homogeneity of the defined strata with respect to the characteristic which is being studied.[3]

The population for this study was comprised of all elementary teachers who were teaching in an elementary school which was conducting or had conducted a Title I program; and also met the restriction that the elementary school was located in the area denoted by the Michigan Education Association as Region VIII of that organization. This area is comprised of the Michigan counties of Clinton, Eaton, Ingham, Livingston, and Shiawassee.

There were thirty-seven school districts in Region VIII;[4] and each school district, at the time of this study, was conducting a Title I program in an elementary school in the district. These thirty-seven school districts in Region VIII were divided into five groups by the investigator. The five groups were determined from the pupil enrollment in grades K-12 as listed by the Michigan Education Association.[5] Each of these five groups was treated as a separate stratum; and the teachers, who were teaching in an elementary school in the district which was conducting a Title I program, were considered as a part of the subpopulations. The following table indicates the grouping of the school districts from pupil enrollment:

---

[3] *Ibid*., p. 39.

[4] S. E. Hecker, J. Meeder, and T. J. Northey, *Michigan Public School District Data, 1967-1968*. (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Education Association, 1968), pp. 28-32.

TABLE I

SCHOOL DISTRICT GROUPING BY PUPIL ENROLLMENT

GROUP NUMBER	PUPIL ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF DISTRICTS
I	up to 999	8
II	1000-1999	12
III	2000-3499	9
IV	3500-6500	7
V	32,347	1

After each of the thirty-seven school districts was classified according to pupil enrollment, it became apparent to the investigator that each of these districts could also be classified according to its type of population center. The types of population centers for each group are described below.

---

[5] *loc. cit.*

Since the pupil enrollment and the type of population center of one district in Region VIII was so much larger than all of the other school districts, the investigator placed this district in Group V by itself.

TABLE II

TYPE OF PUPULATION CENTER

Group I	Small Villages
Group II	Small towns with rural influences
Group III	Towns and suburban communities
Group IV	Small metropolitan centers
Group V	Largest metropolitan center in Region VIII

From each of the first four groups of school districts shown in Table I, one district was randomly selected. This process was used with Groups I - IV to insure the possibility of selecting any one district in a particular group as the representative district for that group; and thus, randomness for each group could be assured. The use of one randomly selected school district from each group allowed the investigator to study a stratified random sample for Groups I - IV. A stratified random sample was made possible because each of the districts selected, using the process described above, was conducting a Title I program in only one elementary school in the district. Therefore, the teachers in the elementary school which was conducting the Title I program became the randomly selected subpopulation for the Group which the school district represented.

Group V presented a different situation. Since there was only one school district in Group V, that district became the representative district for the Group. However, a Title I program was being conducted in thirteen elementary schools in the school district at the time of this study. In order to obtain a random sample from the school district in Group V, one elementary school was selected as the representative school for Group V by using the same procedure described by Barnes to assure randomness. The teachers in the elementary school selected as the representative school for Group V became the randomly selected subpopulation to represent Group V.

Because all the school districts in Region VIII were divided into groups by the investigator according to pupil enrollment and because the subpopulations representing Groups I - V were randomly selected, the sample used in this study was considered to be a stratified random sample of the total population of elementary teachers who were teaching in an elementary school which was conducting or had conducted a Title I program; and also met the restriction that the elementary school was located in the area denoted by the Michigan Education Association as Region VIII of that organization.

Table III indicates the number of teachers comprising each group in the sample and the total number of teachers in the sample.

DATA TO BE COLLECTED

The focus of this study was upon the operation and effects of selected Title I programs. The questionnaire was designed to yield data and information that would lend themselves to the task of studying the operation and effects of Title I programs as these terms were defined in Chapter I.

TABLE III

NUMBER OF TEACHERS BY GROUP AND IN TOTAL

GROUP NUMBER	NUMBER OF TEACHERS
Group I	18
Group II	27
Group III	13
Group IV	10
Group V	19
TOTAL	87

The questionnaire used in this study was developed by the writer to obtain items of general information as well as specific information regarding the hypotheses to be researched.

The sections pertaining to personal data and background were presented in an effort to describe more fully the composition of the sample in relation to teaching experience, tenure in the district, and experience in Title I.

Specific information was sought from the teachers in the sample in order to study their knowledge of Title I programs in the areas of preparation of proposals, goals and objectives, curricular change resulting from Title I, grade levels in which Title I programs were operating, and change in classroom teaching methods.

In addition, data were collected from the summaries of Title I programs submitted by the local district to the Michigan State Department of Education. Where a comparison of the teacher responses and the summaries of the local school district was appropriate, this comparison was made to determine teacher perceptions in relation to the summaries submitted by the local school district to the Michigan State Department of Education.

COLLECTION OF THE DATA

It was decided that the best way to obtain the needed information in this study was by means of a questionnaire to be completed by the teachers themselves. The questionnaire used by the writer and administered to the teachers in the sample was developed after determination of the objectives of this study. The initial questionnaire was submitted to members of the writer's doctoral committee for criticism and suggestion. Then the revised questionnaire was pre-tested with elementary teachers who were not teaching in a school district selected for the study, but who were teaching in an elementary school conducting a Title I program. The results of the suggestions and criticisms of the committee and of the experimental sample of teachers were used to clarify and improve the questionnaire. The questionnaire, as administered in this study, will be found in Appendix A.

Permission was obtained to administer the finalized questionnaire to all the teachers in each of the five elementary schools selected for this study. Each school selected for this study was conducting a Title I program during the 1967-1968 school year.

The questionnaire was administered by the writer to the teachers in each school in the study during a staff meeting so that all the teachers in a given school answered the questionnaire during the same session. Upon completion of the questionnaire, the teachers returned them to the writer before leaving the meeting. Thus, a 100 per cent response was obtained from the total of 87 teachers.

TREATMENT OF THE DATA

The data from the questionnaires were compiled and analyzed to see if they supported or did not support the hypotheses to be tested. Responses for each item were grouped according to frequencies and percentages. Also, where appropriate, the responses of the teachers were compared with the information and evaluation submitted by the local district to the Michigan State Department of Education.

The completed questionnaires were grouped according to the groups listed in Table I, and they were numbered in order to provide a means for cross-checking reaponses to related items.

The responses were tabulated and summarized, and then they were compiled into tables. Master sheets for these tabulations were constructed to conform to the categories and individual items within the categories on the questionnaire. The responses were grouped and totaled in logical and appropriate columns. This facilitated the obtaining of frequencies and percentages.

Attention was given to the summaries of information that related to the limitations and areas of possible significance of this study. Care was taken that the major conclusions were supportable from the data that were processed.

The analysis of the data did not seem to require extensive statistical treatment. The questionnaire items were designed to explore and to gain information regarding Title I programs which could be used to describe the operation and effects of selected Title I programs. The items in the questionnaire combined to make this possible in the manner described.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

INTRODUCTION

The methods of presenting the data of this study were determined from the format of the questionnaire and the procedure of the study as described in the preceding chapter.

The questionnaire used in this study (copy in Appendix A) was developed to obtain items of general information as well as specific information. The data collected in this study were derived from the questionnaire developed by the investigator and administered to the teachers in the sample. The total number of teachers included in the sample was 87 (Table III, Chapter III). Since 87 questionnaires were returned to the writer, there was 100 per cent response. This percentage of response was possible because the questionnaire was administered during a faculty meeting in each school and returned to the investigator upon completion by the teachers. The data collected in the questionnaire are presented in tabular form in this chapter.

In an effort to identify and delineate the sample of teachers used in this study, background information concerning these teachers is given in Tables IV - IX. In Tables X - XXI data are given which pertain to the Title I programs operating in the district at the time of the study and the teachers' perception of these programs.

School districts composing the sample were classified into five groups (as shown in Table I, Chapter III) according to pupil enrollment. Data in Tables IV - XXI are presented for each of these groups as well as for the total sample.

GENERAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO SAMPLE

Tables IV, V, and VI record the teaching experience of the teachers surveyed in this study. Teaching experience was divided into three areas by the writer. These three areas were Total Years Teaching Experience, Teaching Experience in the District, and Teaching Experience in the Building.

When considering the data in Table IV, attention should be drawn to the fact that a majority of teachers in the sample had more than five years total teaching experience. Each sub-group, except Group I, had a majority of teachers with more than five years total teaching experience. If both 2-5 years and more than five years total teaching experience are considered, then the percentage jumps up to 90 per cent of the total sample falling into this area. Since only 10 per cent of the teachers in the total sample are classified as first year teachers, it is obvious that the total sample could be considered as being primarily composed of experienced teachers.

If the limitations of Teaching Experience in the District is imposed, Table V indicates that the percentages are altered only slightly. However, even with this limitation, 74 per cent of the total sample of teachers had taught in the district for more than two years. The total sample could be considered as being primarily composed not only of experienced teachers but also of teachers with teaching experience in the district.

To conclude the teaching experience of the teachers in the sample, Table VI presents the percentages of teachers with teaching experience in the building in which the survey was conducted. Again the percentages change but slightly with 68 per cent of the total sample of teachers having taught two or more years in the building in which the survey was conducted.

These percentages indicate that a large majority of the teachers in the sample were in the same district and in the same building when the 1967-1968 Title I proposal was drafted for the district. This fact becomes significant when consideration is given to the responses of the teachers regarding their perceptions of the Title I program operating in their building at the time this study was conducted.

Further background information is presented in Table VII. This table indicates the educational preparation of the teachers in the sample. 69 per cent of the total teachers in the sample had received a B.A. degree, 20 per cent had received an M.A. degree, and only 11 per cent had no degree. Groups IV and V did not have a teacher without a degree. As indicated in Table I, Chapter III, these two groups had the largest pupil enrollment.

Teacher certification in Michigan should be discussed prior to consideration of Table VIII.

TABLE IV
TOTAL YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE

GROUP NUMBER	1 YEAR		2-5 YEARS		MORE THAN 5 YEARS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
I	3	17	9	50	6	33
II	2	7	10	37	15	56
III	2	15	4	31	7	54
IV	1	10	3	30	6	60
V	1	5	7	37	11	58
TOTAL	9	10	33	38	45	52

TABLE V

TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN THE DISTRICT

GROUP NUMBER	1 YEAR		2-5 YEARS		MORE THAN 5 YEARS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
I	6	33	7	39	5	28
II	5	19	8	30	14	51
III	4	31	4	31	5	38
IV	5	50	3	30	2	20
V	3	16	6	32	10	52
TOTAL	23	26	28	32	36	42

TABLE VI

TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN THE BUILDING

GROUP NUMBER	1 YEAR		2-5 YEARS		MORE THAN 5 YEARS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
I	9	50	6	33	3	17
II	6	22	11	41	10	37
III	4	31	5	38	4	31
IV	6	60	3	30	1	10
V	3	16	8	42	8	42
TOTAL	28	32	33	38	26	30

There were two broad categories of teacher certification in Michigan at the time of this study. One category was classified by the writer as "Provisional" and the other as "Permanent." A Provisional Certificate was considered in this study as any type of certificate issued by the State of Michigan which required additional college credits for validation. A Permanent Certificate was considered in this study as any type of certificate issued by the State of Michigan which did not require additional college credits for validation. One type of Permanent Certificate issued by the State of Michigan in previous years was the "Life" Certificate. A teacher was not necessarily required to have completed a degree in order to receive a Life Certificate. It should be noted that the State of Michigan no longer issues the Life Certificate and all teacher certification for Permanent Certificate requires the completion of a B.A. degree plus the completion of additional graduate credits. However, 11 per cent of the teachers in this study, who did not have a degree, indicated on their questionnaires that they did possess a Life Certificate.

As indicated in Table VIII, the teachers in this sample were almost evenly divided between Provisional Certification and Permanent Certification. 54 per cent possessed Provisional Certificates and 46 per cent possessed Permanent Certificates.

Data concerning teaching experience in Title I programs are presented in Table IX. This Table concludes the general information portion of the questionnaire used in this study. 84 per cent of the teachers indicated they were not now teaching in a Title I program; 72 per cent

TABLE VII

EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION

GROUP NUMBER	NO DEGREE		B.A.		M.A.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
I	4	22	12	67	1	6
II	4	15	19	70	4	15
III	2	15	8	62	3	23
IV	0	0	8	80	2	20
V	0	0	12	63	7	37
TOTAL	10	11	59	69	17	20

TABLE VIII

TYPES OF MICHIGAN CERTIFICATION

GROUP NUMBER	PROVISIONAL CERTIFICATION		PERMANENT CERTIFICATION	
	N	%	N	%
I	12	67	6	33
II	16	59	11	41
III	6	46	7	54
IV	5	50	5	50
V	8	42	11	58
TOTAL	47	54	40	46

stated they had not taught in a Title I program in the district; and 97 per cent said they had never taught in a Title I program in some other district. It would appear that a large majority of the teachers surveyed in this study consider they have never taught in a Title I program.

In summation of the general information given by the teachers, as reported in Tables IV - IX, the following statements are presented:

1. A large majority of teachers comprising the sample used in this study have been teaching more than two years in the district and building in which they are now located. This would indicate that they were also in the building in which the Title I program was operating at the time the proposal for that Title I program was developed.

2. 89 per cent of the teachers possess at least a B.A. degree.

3. The sample of teachers is almost evenly divided between provisional and permenent certification by the State of Michigan.

4. Quite a large majority of the teachers in the sample have not taught in a Title I program either in their district or in another district.

TEACHER PERCEPTION OF TITLE I PROGRAMS

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the questionnaire was devised so that specific information could be solicited from the teachers in the sample regarding their knowledge of the Title I program operating in the building in which these teachers were teaching. Also, where applicable, the teacher

TABLE IX

TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN TITLE I PROGRAMS

	TEACHING NOW IN TITLE I				TAUGHT IN TITLE I IN DISTRICT				TAUGHT IN TITLE I IN OTHER DISTRICT			
	YES		NO		YES		NO		YES		NO	
GROUP NUMBER	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I	0	0	18	100	2	11	16	89	0	0	18	100
II	8	30	19	70	3	11	18	67	2	7	25	93
III	2	15	11	85	2	15	10	77	0	0	13	100
IV	1	10	9	90	0	0	9	90	1	10	9	90
V	3	16	16	84	6	32	10	52	0	0	19	100
TOTALS	14	16	73	84	13	15	63	72	3	3	84	97

responses to questions were compared with the summary report submitted by the local school district to the Michigan State Department of Education. The remainder of this chapter presents these data pertaining to specific information of teacher perception of Title I programs in their districts.

The proposal submitted by the school district for the Title I program it operated during 1967-1968 was developed during the 1966-1967 school year. As already noted in Tables V and VI, quite a large majority of the teachers in the sample were in the same district and the same building during the 1966-1967 school year. However, Table X shows that only 18 per cent of the total teachers in the sample indicated that they had taken part in the preparation of the Title I program in their district. The question from which this information was obtained allowed the teachers to indicate the extent of their participation in the area of preparation of the Title I proposal. The teachers were allowed to check more than one area of participation. Even though the teachers could check more than one answer, Table X shows that only three areas were checked at all. Of the three areas indicated by the teachers as their part in the preparation of the Title I proposal. Table X shows that 13 of the possible 16 responses indicated the extent of this teacher participation was "Submitted Suggestions." This would seem to indicate that a vast majority of the teachers considered themselves as having had no part in the preparation

TABLE X

TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN PREPARATION OF TITLE I PROPOSAL

	GROUPS											
	I		II		III		IV		V		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TEACHER PREPARATION OF PROPOSAL	1	6	8	30	4	31	2	20	1	5	16	18
TYPE OF PARTICIPATION BY TEACHER												
SOLE RESPONSIBILITY	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	2
MEMBER OF COMMITTEE	1	6	4	15	2	15	0	0	0	0	7	8
CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUBMITTED SUGGESTIONS	1	6	4	15	3	23	2	20	3	16	13	15
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

of the Title I proposal for their district. In addition to this, submitting suggestions was the area of participation reported most often by those teachers who indicated they had participated in the preparation of the Title I proposal for their district.

Table XI contains data relating to teacher responses concerning participation in the preparation of Title I proposals in relation to teaching experience in a Title I program. These data do not seem to indicate any significant pattern which might indicate that teaching experience or lack of experience in Title I programs and participation in the preparation of Title I proposals are related.

Goals of the Title I program operating in a school district had to be determined at the time the proposal was submitted to the State Department of Education. When the teachers in the sample were asked who determined the goals for the Title I program in their district, 59 per cent responded that they did not know, as indicated in Table XII. Also contained in this table is the information obtained from teacher responses concerning their perceptions on who did determine the goals of the Title I program. Once again teachers were allowed more than one response. It is interesting to note that only 11 per cent of Group I, 26 per cent of Group II, zero per cent of Group III, 10 per cent of Group IV, and 21 per cent of Group V could correctly identify the person(s) responsible for determining the goals of the Title I program in their particular districts. These percen-

TABLE XI

TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN TITLE I AND PARTICIPATION IN PREPARATION OF TITLE I PROPOSAL

GROUP	I	II	III	IV	V
NUMBER WITH EXPERIENCE	2	13	4	2	9
PER CENT WHO PARTICIPATED	50%	38%	0%	0%	11%
NUMBER WITHOUT EXPERIENCE	16	14	9	8	10
PER CENT WHO PARTICIPATED	0%	22%	45%	25%	0%

TABLE XII

TEACHER PERCEPTION OF PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING GOALS OF TITLE I PROGRAM

PERSON RESPONSIBLE	I		II		III		IV		V		TOTAL	
FOR DETERMINING GOAL	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DON'T KNOW	10	56	11	41	7	54	8	80	15	79	51	59
PRINCIPAL	5	28	6	22	2	15	0	0	2	11	15	17
SUPERINTENDENT	4	22	0	0	1	8	0	0	2	11	7	8
CENTRAL OFFICE	2	11	0	0	0*	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
COMMITTEE OF TEACHERS	3	17	7	26	2	15	1*	10	2	11	15	17
TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS	5	28	8	30	5	38	2	20	4	21	24	28
COORDINATOR OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS	2*	11	7*	26	0	0	0	0	4	21	13	15
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* Indicates person responsible for determining goals of Title I program for that Group as reported to the Michigan State Department of Education.

tages were determined by the investigator after comparing the teacher responses with the district summary submitted to the Michigan State Department of Education. These percentages indicate that very few of the teachers could correctly identify the person(s) responsible for the determination of the goals of the Title I program operating in their particular districts.

Since only a small number of the total sample of teachers considered themselves as having had a part in preparing the Title I proposal for their district and in determining the goals of the Title I program for their district, perhaps the percentages contained in Table XIII are more understandable. When asked if they had changed their teaching methods as a result of the Title I program in their district, 59 per cent of the teachers in the sample responded that they had not changed their teaching methods.

When a school district submits its proposal to the State Department of Education and when it submits the summary and evaluation of the Title I program which was operated in the district to the State Department of Education, one of the items contained in both reports is the grade level(s) in which the Title I program will operate. A comparison of the responses of the teachers with the reports submitted by the district to the Michigan State Department of Education was made to determine the correctness of the responses given by the teachers in the sample to to the question, "In what grade or grades is/was the

TABLE XIII

CLASSROOM TEACHING METHODS CHANGED BECAUSE OF TITLE I PROGRAM

GROUP NUMBER	YES N	YES %	NO N	NO %
I	3	17	15	83
II	11	41	16	59
III	7	54	6	46
IV	4	40	6	60
V	11	58	8	42
TOTAL	36	41	51	59

TABLE XIV

TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF GRADE LEVELS IN WHICH TITLE I PROGRAM WAS OPERATED

GROUP	GRADE LEVEL OF PROGRAM	K		1		2		3		4		5		6	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I	1, 4-6	4	22	7	39	7	39	3	17	4	22	4	22	4	22
II	K-6	17	63	25	93	25	93	25	93	25	93	25	93	25	93
III	K-6	9	69	12	92	12	92	12	92	12	92	12	92	-	-
IV	K-6	8	80	9	90	9	90	9	90	9	90	9	90	9	90
V	K-6	7	37	7	37	7	37	7	37	7	37	7	37	7	37
TOTAL		45	52	60	69	60	69	56	64	57	66	57	66	45	61

Title I program operating in your district?" As indicated in Table XIV, a large majority of Groups II, III, and IV correctly indicated the grade levels of the Title I program in their districts. But Groups I and V each had less than 40 per cent who were able to identify correctly the grade levels of the Title I program in their districts.

When comparing the responses of those teachers in the sample who had teaching experience in Title I programs with the responses of those teachers who had not had teaching experience in Title I programs in the area of change in teaching methods, it is interesting to note that those teachers who had taught in a Title I program appear to have changed their teaching methods as a result of the Title I program. Whereas, those teachers who had not taught in a Title I program were less likely to change their teaching methods. This would seem to indicate that experience teaching in a Title I program would be more likely to produce change in teaching methods. These data are contained in Table XV.

A small percentage of the teachers in the sample responded that a former Title I program was now financed by the local district instead of being financed by the federal government. However, 67 per cent of the teachers in the sample responded "Don't Know" to the question of financing educational programs from local funds that were formerly financed from federal funds. Information obtained by the investigator from administrators in each of the

TABLE XV

TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN TITLE I AND CHANGES IN METHODS

GROUP	I	II	III	IV	V
NUMBER WITH EXPERIENCE	2	13	4	2	9
PER CENT WHO CHANGED METHODS	50%	54%	100%	50%	45%
NUMBER WITHOUT EXPERIENCE	16	14	9	8	10
PER CENT WHO CHANGED METHODS	13%	14%	22%	13%	50%

TABLE XVI

TEACHER RESPONSE THAT A FORMER TITLE I PROGRAM
IS NOW FINANCED BY DISTRICT

GROUP NUMBER	YES N	%	NO N	%	DON'T KNOW N	%
I	1	6	6	33	11	61
II	0	0	10	37	16	59
III	1	8	5	38	7	54
IV	0	0	3	30	7	70
V	2	11	0	0	17	89
TOTAL	4	5	24	28	58	67

districts indicated that the districts had not financed former Title I programs. These data are presented in Table XVI.

When asked "In your opinion, should the Title I program now operating in your district become a part of your elementary curriculum if the financing of the program had to be provided from local funds instead of federal funds?", 62 per cent of the teachers answered "yes". However, 48 per cent of the 62 per cent of the teachers in the sample indicated they felt the local district was not likely to furnish the finances necessary if federal funds were withdrawn. These data are presented in Tables XVII and XVIII respectively.

The teachers were asked what was the primary goal of the Title I program in their district, and more than 50 per cent of the teachers in Groups II and III selected the correct goal from a list of possible goals stated on the questionnaire. But less than 50 per cent of the teachers in Groups I, IV, and V were able to make this selection. The writer was able to determine the correctness of the responses by the teachers in the sample because each local district was required to submit the goals of the Title I program operating in its district to the Michigan State Department of Education. The responses of the teachers are compared in Table XIX with the report of the local district. Teachers were allowed to select more than one possible goal, but the goal of the Title I program in each district was included in the

TABLE XVII

TITLE I PROGRAM SHOULD BE FINANCED BY LOCAL DISTRICT

GROUP NUMBER	YES N	YES %	NO N	NO %	NO RESPONSE N	NO RESPONSE %
I	6	33	4	22	8	44
II	15	56	11	41	1	4
III	11	85	2	15	0	0
IV	8	80	2	20	0	0
V	14	74	5	26	0	0
TOTAL	54	62	24	28	9	10

TABLE XVIII

DO YOU EXPECT THE TITLE I PROGRAM WILL BE FINANCED BY LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT?

GROUP	YES		NO	
NUMBER	N	%	N	%
I	2	33	4	66
II	6	40	9	60
III	5	50	5	50
IV	4	57	3	43
V	5	45	6	55
TOTAL	24	52	23	48

The figures in this Table were compiled from the responses given by teachers who believed the Title I program should be financed by the local school district.

list of possible selections. In no instance did a teacher select only the stated goal of the Title I program in his district to the exclusion of one or more of the suggested goals on the questionnaire.

If consideration is given to the relationship of teaching experience in Title I programs and knowledge of the goals of the Title I program, the data contained in Table XX would seem to indicate that teaching experience in Title I would not necessarily result in knowledge of the goals of the Title I program.

Finally, in Table XXI a comparison is made between the grade levels of the Title I program and the knowledge of the teachers in those grade levels concerning the goals of the program. For every grade level in which the Title I program was conducted, the number of correct teacher responses and corresponding percentages were tabulated by Group and by grade level. If the Title I program was not conducted in a grade level, then a hyphen (-) was inserted in place of the number of responses and percentage. The writer was able to determine the correctness of teacher responses by comparing them with the report submitted to the Michigan State Department of Education by the local school district. The grade levels in which the Title I program was conducted by the district was also determined from the report by the district to the Michigan State Department of Education.

Groups II and III appear to have a large majority of teachers who are well aware of the

TABLE XIX

GOALS OF TITLE I PROGRAM AS SELECTED BY TEACHERS WITH SPECIAL INDICATION OF DISTRICT GOAL FOR EACH GROUP

	GROUPS											
	I		II		III		IV		V		TOTAL	
POSSIBLE GOALS OF TITLE I PROGRAM	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
IMPROVE SELF-CONCEPT OF PUPILS	7*	39	20	74	12	92	4	40	16	84	59	68
IMPROVE PHYSICAL WELFARE OF PUPILS	5	28	12	44	3	23	1	10	14	74	35	40
PROVIDE HEALTH SERVICES	4	22	5	19	3	23	1	10	13	68	26	30
IMPROVE SUBJECT MATTER SKILLS	6	33	22	81	11	85	10	100	3	16	52	60
IMPROVE TEACHER KNOWLEDGE OF DISADVANTAGED	2	11	12	44	6	46	2	20	10	52	32	37
IMPROVE IMAGE OF SCHOOL FOR PUPILS	7	39	18*	67	11*	85	3*	30	9*	47	48	55
INVOLVE PARENTS IN SCHOOL PROGRAM	4	22	5	19	3	23	2	20	13	68	27	31

TABLE XIX (continued)

POSSIBLE GOALS OF TITLE I PROGRAM	I N	I %	II N	II %	III N	III %	IV N	IV %	V N	V %	TOTAL N	TOTAL %
PROVIDE AID TO CLASSROOM TEACHER WITH REMEDIAL WORK	3	17	11	41	10	77	8	80	6	32	38	44
DEVELOP INNOVATIVE ATTITUDES AND METHODS AMONG TEACHERS	1	6	4	15	5	38	1	10	8	42	19	22
IMPROVE LIBRARY RESOURCES	2	11	5	19	3	23	1	10	7	37	18	21
USE OF NEW AND DIFFERENT MEDIA IN ROOMS	3	17	12	44	4	31	2	20	6	32	27	31
DEVELOP PERCEPTUAL ABILITIES OF PUPILS	2	11	17	63	9	69	2	20	13	68	43	49
IMPROVE GUIDANCE SERVICES	3	17	5	19	7	54	1	10	3	16	19	22
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* Indicates goals listed by the local school district in its report to the Michigan State Department of Education.

TABLE XX

TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN TITLE I AND KNOWLEDGE OF GOALS

GROUP	I	II	III	IV	V
NUMBER WITH EXPERIENCE	2	13	4	2	9
PER CENT WHO KNEW GOALS	100%	69%	75%	0%	45%
NUMBER WITHOUT EXPERIENCE	16	14	9	8	10
PER CENT WHO KNEW GOALS	38%	64%	89%	38%	50%

goals of the Title I program operating in their grade levels. However, Groups I, IV, and V have less than 50 per cent of the teachers who are able to designate the goal of the Title I program operating in their grade level. It is also interesting to note that the over-all percentage of teachers in this sample knowing the goals of the Title I program in their grade level is just 50 per cent.

The data derived from the questionnaires given to the teachers who comprised the sample for this study are used as the basis for the conclusions reached and stated in Chapter V. Also, Chapter V contains the summary and recommendations for further research.

TABLE XXI

TEACHER RESPONSES BY GRADE LEVEL TAUGHT AND CORRECT SELECTION OF GOAL OF TITLE I PROGRAM

GRADE LEVEL OF TITLE I PROGRAM	TEACHER RESPONSES AND CORRECT SELECTION BY GROUPS											
	I		II		III		IV		V		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
K	-	-	3	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	5
1	0	0	2	7	3	23	2	20	1	5	8	9
2	-	-	1	4	1	8	1	10	2	11	5	6
3	-	-	3	11	1	8	1	10	3	16	8	9
4	2	11	3	11	3	23	0	0	1	5	9	10
5	1	6	3	11	2	15	0	0	1	5	7	8
6	1	6	2	7	-	-	0	0	0	0	3	3
TOTALS	4	22	17	63	10	77	4	40	9	47	44	50

_ Indicates Title I program was not operated in this Group at this grade level.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

When the United States Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and President Johnson signed the bill into law, the national government made a large-scale commitment to support educational programs with federal money. Each Title of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was designed to support a specific type of educational program. One such program was designed to help educate the economically disadvantaged. This was Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. One of the goals of Title I was to provide "seed" money to change educational programs offered by school districts to those youth who were considered to come from economically disadvantaged homes. The purpose of this study was to investigate and determine what effect selected Title I programs had on elementary curricula.

With such an undertaking as Title I, it was only natural to have the federal government require an evaluation of the programs funded under Title I. However, the federal government did not specify a particular evaluation procedure. This was left up to the various State Departments of Education to determine. But the various State Departments of Education did not require a standard form of evaluation by the local school districts in the reports of the local school districts to the State Department of Education. Since the federal and state governments did not specify a particular evaluation procedure, the local district was allowed to determine its own means of evaluation. In no instance was evaluation equated to curriculum change. For the purposes of this study curriculum, educational program, operation, effects, and goals were defined as reported in Chapter I.

Title I promised high hopes of helping solve the educational problems of the disadvantaged children in the United States. But three years of operation of Title I have brought mixed reactions from critics and supporters. These reactions vary from complete failure to being on the verge of a significant breakthrough in the education of disadvantaged children.

The review of the literature not only reveals the federal government has provided categorical support for education since 1785, but also prior to the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (E.S.E.A.) programs supported by the federal government did not attempt to change educational programs for a specific socio-economic group. The closest comparison to such an effort to change curriculum is probably the money provided by various foundations. Over the last several years many foundations have provided money for experimental or exploratory programs.

Most of the programs funded by foundations were related to secondary education or college education, and only a few pertained to teaching in the elementary schools.

Even though there were only a small number of foundation projects related to elementary education, the results of these projects would appear to indicate Title I programs can make a meaningful contribution to disadvantaged youngsters. Perhaps, the reason that Title I is only on the verge of a significant breakthrough in the education of the disadvantaged is because, generally, Title I programs that have been funded by the federal government have neglected some of the principles of the complexity of change in general and the complexity of curriculum change in particular.

Curriculum change is a long, slow process; and it requires concerted effort to change not only the educational program offered to students, but also effort to change human dynamics. In order for curriculum change to become most effective, it is necessary for the teacher himself to change. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was a deliberate attempt on the part of the federal government to influence curriculum change in the area of education for disadvantaged youth. If this effort by the federal government is to be successful, the Title I programs should concentrate on the need for changing teacher insights, attitudes, and skills.

One part of the process of curriculum change is the need for evaluation. As mentioned earlier, there is no standard form for evaluation of Title I programs. There have been many national curriculum movements in almost every area of education. These movements have emphasized the need for on-going evaluation procedures. Plans and procedures for evaluation should be a simultaneous part of curriculum change.

The emphasis of Title I programs has been directed toward elementary children, and the importance of the teacher in the teaching-learning situation becomes a major area of concern. Time and time again research has shown that as the teacher changes, so does the curriculum and so do the teaching-learning situations. In the limited number of descriptions of programs for the disadvantaged, which may be found in the literature, one important fact stands out. There is a definite lack of success in changing teachers in these programs in their insights, attitudes, and skills.

In the early stages of determining an area to investigate, the writer became concerned with Title I programs and the effect these programs might be having on elementary curricula and on the children participating in Title I programs. The writer believed if a program were educationally sound and successfully funded under Title I, then similar or related programs appropriate for other grade levels should be educationally sound, also. And in order for a Title I program to be completely successful, all the teachers in the school should be aware of the goal of the Title I program and try to implement this goal according to their grade level and the need of the students being taught. The data presented in Chapter IV led the writer to the conclusions presented below.

CONCLUSIONS

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has supplied billions of dollars to local school districts across the nation in an effort to improve the educational programs offered disadvantaged youth. This money was spent on various types of educational programs. Since no standard form of evaluation was required by either the federal or state governments, the writer designed this study as a pilot study to investigate and describe the operation and effects of selected Title I programs. As such, this is a report on what actually existed at the time of this study and was not an attempt to evaluate the Title I programs studied as being successful or unsuccessful. When the data are analyzed in relation to the hypotheses presented in Chapter I, the following conclusions seem to be appropriate:

Although elementary teachers did participate in the preparation of Title I proposals in their districts, attention should be drawn to Table X in determining the amount of this participation. Only 18 per cent of the teachers perceived themselves as participating in the preparation of the Title I proposal in their districts. Table XII shows that zero to twenty-six (0-26) per cent of the teachers responding to the questionnaire were able to identify the person or persons responsible for determining the goals of the Title I proposal. These percentages were determined by the investigator by comparing the report of the local district in its summary submitted to the Michigan State Department of Education and the responses of the teachers in the sample. These figures indicate that elementary teachers did not serve on the committee which determined the goals for the Title I program in their district as stated in Hypothesis #1. In addition, these figures indicate the teachers did not even know the person(s) responsible for determining these goals.

According to Table XV, the teachers in Groups II, III, and IV knew the grade levels in which the Title I programs were operated. But Groups I and V had less than 40 per cent who knew the grade levels of the Title I programs in their districts.

Since four of the five groups conducted Title I programs in all elementary grades, the second hypothesis would seem to lack any relevance. However, upon closer examination the data presented in Table XXI indicates that only Groups II and III had a large number of teachers who even knew the primary goal of the Title I program in their grade level. The over-all percentage of teachers who knew the goal of the Title I program in their own grade level was only 50 per cent. These figures lead to the conclusion that teachers are not aware of the goals of the Title I program even if the grade level of the program is the same as the grade level in which the teacher is teaching.

59 per cent of the teachers in the sample stated they had not changed their classroom teaching methods because of the Title I program in their district. This information is contained in Table XIII and would seem to support the third hypothesis--teachers have not changed their classroom teaching methods because of the Title I program operating in their district.

The data collected in this study also indicate that hypothesis #4 is valid. Only 5 per cent of the teachers indicate that a former Title I program is now financed locally. However, administrators from each district in the sample stated that no former Title I program is now financed from local funds. It is interesting to note that 62 per cent of the teachers said the program should be financed locally, but 48 per cent of that 62 per cent stated that, in their opinion, the Title I program would not be financed locally if federal funds were withdrawn. These data are contained in Tables XVI, XVII, and XVIII.

Since all of the specific hypotheses studied in this investigation were found to support the research hypothesis, it would seem that the research hypothesis would be true, and the operation and effects of selected elementary Title I programs would not result in an elementary curriculum change. From the review of the literature and from responses of teachers in this study, it would seem difficult, if not impossible, to effect a change in curriculum (as defined in Chapter I) unless the teachers in the various school districts: 1) participate in the preparation of the Title I proposal; 2) know the goals of the Title I program operating in their district; and 3) change their classroom teaching methods.

The writer found it hard to believe from this study that Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was actually accomplishing the goals for which it was enacted. One of the saddest commentaries given to the writer during this study was the comment of one elementary principal. This principal stated that the reason a particular teacher was assigned to be the Title I teacher was because it was felt that this teacher would cause less damage to children as a Title I teacher (a smaller number of children would be taught by this teacher) than if this teacher were a regular classroom teacher.

As stated in Chapter III and repeated earlier in this chapter, this study was undertaken to provide information about what existed at the time of this study. From the data collected in this study, it would seem to be apparent that some recommendations and further research would be appropriate in regard to Title I programs as studied in this investigation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The data collected in this study and the conclusions reached above lead this investigator to make the following recommendations:

1. All teachers in an elementary school conducting a Title I program should be involved in determining the goals of the program. Since the data indicated that approximately one-fourth of the teachers in the sample were teaching their first year in the building, a concerted effort should be made to acquaint these new teachers with the goals of the Title I program in the building in which they are teaching.
2. Some form of in-service training should be a part of the Title I program. This approach should strive to educate teachers to the fact that new teaching techniques and better understanding of the disadvantaged are prime requisites for a more satisfactory educational program for the disadvantaged.
3. The Title I program should be planned so that it is educationally desireable to include this program in the elementary curriculum and to provide for local funds to finance the program after it it incorporated into the elementary curriculum. Once a Title I program is financed locally, a new innovative program could be developed and could be financed under Title I. With this progression of Title I funds to local funds, the true spirit of Title I, providing seed money for

curricular change, could become a reality as it was intended to become.

4. Sufficient time should be allowed to change the insights, attitudes, and skills of the teachers who are teaching in a building in which a Title I program is conducted.

5. And finally, further research should be conducted to determine:

   a. What happens to children in Title I programs after they leave the program.
   b. What effect new techniques and understanding of the disadvantaged have on children when compared to continuance of the status quo.
   c. What effect a Title I program of in-service education for teachers would have on the educational program for all students in a school, not just the disadvantaged.
   d. How colleges and universities can better train teachers to cope with the problems of teaching the disadvantaged.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Barnes, Fred P. Research for the Practitioner in Education. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, Department of Elementary School Principals, 1964.

Beauchamp, George A. Planning the Elementary School Curriculum. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1956.

Bestor, Arthur E. The Restoration of Learning. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956.

Caswell, Hollis B. and Associates. Curriculum Improvement in Public School Systems. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1950.

Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.

Dufay, Frank R. Ungrading the Elementary School. West Nyack, N. Y.: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1966.

Goodlad, John I. The Changing School Curriculum. New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1966.

Hecker, S. E., Meeder, J., and Northey, T. J. Michigan Public School District Data, 1967-1968, East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Education Association, 1968.

Keppel, Francis. The Necessary Revolution in American Education. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966.

Krug, Edward A. Curriculum Planning. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1950.

McNally, Harold J., Passow, A. Harry, and Associates. Improving the Quality of Public School Programs. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1960.

Millstein, Abe. "The Effect of Teacher Participation in Curriculum Guide Development Upon Selected Classroom Practices." Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, Stanford University, 1960.

Pritzkau, Philo T. Dynamics of Curriculum Improvement. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.

Ragan, William B. Modern Elementary Curriculum. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Rickover, Hyman G. Education and Freedom. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1959.

Saylor, J. Galen and Alexander, William M. Curriculum Planning. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1954.

Smith, B. Othaniel, Stanlye, William O., and Shores, H. Harlan. Fundamentals of Curriculum Development. Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: The World Book Company, 1950.

Spears, Harold. Curriculum Planning Through In-Service Programs. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957.

Taba, Hilda. Curriculum Development. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1962.

The Fund for the Advancement of Education. Decade of Experiment. New York: 1961.

The Fund for the Advancement of Education. A Report for 1962-64. New York: 1965.

JOURNALS

Campbell, Roald F. and Sroufe, Gerald R., "Toward a Rationale for Federal-State-Local Relations in Education," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (September, 1965), p. 6.

Cauman, Judith, "The Fine Art of Follow Through," Grade Teacher, Vol. 84, No. 4 (December, 1966), p. 104.

Doherty, Victor W. "The Carnegie Professional Growth Program: An Experiment in the In-Service Education of Teachers," The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 18 (Fall, 1967), p. 262.

Elam, Stanley M. Editorial, Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (September, 1965), p. 1.

Fuller, Edgar, "Government Financing of Public and Private Education," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (March, 1966), p. 366.

Keppel, Francis. "The National Commitment to Education," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (December, 1965), p. 167.

Kincaid, Gerald L., "A Title I Short Course for Reading Teachers," The Reading Teacher, Vol. 20, No. 4 (January, 1967), p. 307.

What's New in the E.S.E.A. Amendments," American Education, Vol. 3, No. 2 (February, 1967), p. 18.

PAMPHLETS

Stratemeyer, Florence. "Effective Use of Curriculum Materials," Contributions to Education, Number 460. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931, p. 3.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Conference on Education of the Disadvantaged. Report of a National Conference held in Washington, D. C., July 18-20, 1966, p. 5.

United States Office of Education, Guidelines: Special Programs for Educationally Deprived Children. (Washington Government Printing Office, 1966), FOREWARD.

NEWSPAPER

Associated Press dispatch. The Raton (New Mexico) Daily Range, May 3, 1968.

INTERVIEW

Dr. Stanley Oviatt, Director of Evaluation Federal Programs, Michigan State Department of Education, April, 1968, an interview.

ERIC

Connors, C. Keith and Eisenberg, Leon. "The Effect of Teacher Behavior on Verbal Intelligence in Operation Head Start Children," Final Report. U. S. Office of Education, Research Project ED 010 782, 1966, p. 23.

Gerwitz, Marvin H. and others. "Teaching the Disadvantaged - Summer Institute for Professional Training of Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators," Final Report. U. S. Office of Education, Research Project ED 011 018, 1966, p. 1.

Obradovic, Sylvia M. "Evaluation of a Workshop for Teachers Newly Assigned to Inner City Schools," U. S. Office of Education, Research Project ED 011 242, 1966, p. 30.

Seashore, Charles N. "Regional Meetings in Evaluation Research," Office of Education, Research Project ED 010 229, 1966, p. 10.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR A STUDY OF THE OPERATION AND EFFECTS OF TITLE I

1. How many years have you taught (including this year)?

_____years

2. How many years have you taught in this district?

_____years

3. How many years have you taught in this building?

_____years

4. What teaching certificate(s) do you hold?

____

5. What college work have you completed?

__________Less than Bachelor's degree

__________degree plus______________semester/term hours

6. What grade level(s) are you teaching?

_____grade

(For nongraded, please approximate the grade level taught as if your school were graded.)

7. Are you now teaching in a Title I program?

_____yes _____no

If no, have you ever taught in a Title I program in this district?

_____yes _____no

8. Have you ever taught in a Title I program in some other district?

_____yes _____no

9. Did you help prepare the Title I proposal for your district?

_____yes _____no

If yes, which of the following best describes your part in the preparation of the proposal?

(a) _____Sole responsibility

(b) _____Member of committee

(c)_____Chairman of committee

(d)_____Submitted suggestions

(e) _____Other (Please specify)______________________________

10. Who determined the goals of the Title I proposal for your district? (You may mark more than one.)

(a) _____I don't know

(b) _____Principal

(c) _____Superintendent

(d) _____Central Office

(e)_____Committee of Teachers

(f)_____Teachers and Administrators

(g)_____Coordinator of Federal Program

(h)_____Other (Specify)___________

11. Have you changed your classroom teaching methods because of Title I programs?

_____yes _____no

If yes, which of the following describes how you have changed your methods?

(a) _____More emphasis on individual pupil

(b) _____More individual consideration in assignments

(c) _____Less concern for "finishing the book"

(d) _____More concern for physical welfare of pupils

(e) _____More movement by pupils into and out of groups

(f) _____Less homework

(g) _____More classroom freedom for pupils to move about

(h) _____Less structured academic program

(i) _____More use of Audio-Visual equipment

(j) _____Less emphasis on grades

(k) _____Other (Please specify)______________________________

____

12. In what grade or grades is/was the Title I program operating in your district?

____

13. Has a former Title I program in your district become a part of your elementary curriculum and no longer financed by Title I funds?

_____yes _____no _____I don't know

14. In your opinion, should the Title I program now operating in your district become a part of your elementary curriculum if the financing of the program had to be provided from local funds instead of federal funds?

_____yes _____no

Why?

15. Which of the following describes the goals of the Title I program now operating in your district or that was operated in your district?

(a) _____improve self-concept of pupils

(b) _____improve physical welfare of pupils (food, clothes, etc.)

(c) _____provide health services (medical, dental)

(d) _____improve subject matter skills

(e) _____improve teacher knowledge of disadvantaged

(f) _____improve image of school for pupils

(g) _____involve parents in school program

(h) _____provide aid to classroom teacher with remedial work

(i) _____develop innovative attitudes and methods among teachers

(j) _____improve library resources

(k) _____use of new and different media in classrooms

(l) _____develop perceptual abilities of pupils

(m) _____improve guidance services

(n) _____Other (Please specify)______________________________

____